

REMARKS

In response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicants seek reconsideration thereof. In this response, Applicants neither amend nor add any claims. Accordingly, claims 1-5, 7-13, 15, 17-24 and 26-30 are pending.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-5, 7-13, 15, 18-24, 27, 28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,764,483 to Ohashi et al. ("Ohashi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,026,896 to Hunter et al. ("Hunter"). In making the rejection, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the cooling unit of Ohashi with the temperature sensor of Hunter so that when sensing the temperature of the electronic device it initiates fluid movement when the threshold temperature is detected. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In order to render a claim obvious, the relied upon references must teach or suggest every limitation of the claim such that the invention as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one skilled in the art. To combine references, the Examiner must show that the elements are taught or suggested by the references and that the references can be combined and that the references suggest or motivate such combination. Hunter discloses a semiconductor fabrication system comprising a method of controlling the temperature of multiple processing components. Hunter Col. 2, lines 24-26; Col. 2, lines 62-63. The Examiner cites Hunter Col. 2, lines 29-35 for disclosing cooling a computer. Applicants have reviewed the Examiner's cited sections of Hunter and respectfully submit that Hunter does not teach a technique for cooling a computer.

Hunter discloses "a system for controlling the temperature of multiple components or devices of **semiconductor processing equipment**." Hunter Col. 3, lines 29-31 (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has misread Hunter and that Hunter discloses a cooling system for the equipment used to fabricate a semiconductor during the fabrication process and not a computing device and therefore does not provide the necessary

motivation to combine with Ohashi as the Examiner suggests. Thus, Hunter's failure to suggest or motivate a technique for cooling a computing device comprising sensing a temperature of an electronic component and causing a fluid to move when a threshold temperature is detected, fails to cure the defect of Ohashi. The failure of Hunter to cure the defect in Ohashi is fatal to the asserted rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-13, 15, 18-24, 27, 28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ohashi in view of Hunter be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejects claims 7, 17, 26, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohashi in view of Hunter, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,333,676 to Mizuno ("Mizuno"). The Examiner states given the teachings of Mizuno, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the cooling system of Ohashi with a fluid container coupled to a tube having a sensor for sensing when fluid is low in a fluid container. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants incorporate in full the arguments set forth above with respect to the teachings of Hunter. Also, Applicants respectfully submit that Mizuno fails to teach or suggest a technique for cooling a computing device comprising sensing a temperature of an electronic component and causing a fluid to move when a threshold temperature is detected. Thus, neither Ohashi, Hunter nor Mizuno teach or suggest a technique for cooling a computing device comprising sensing a temperature of an electronic component and causing a fluid to move when a threshold temperature is detected. The failure of Hunter to cure the defect in Ohashi and Hunter is fatal to the asserted rejection.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 7, 17, 26, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohashi in view of Hunter and further in view of Mizuno be withdrawn.



CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending (1) are in proper form, (2) are neither obvious nor anticipated by the relied upon art of record, and (3) are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 7/30/03

By: William T. Babbitt
William Thomas Babbitt; Reg. No. 39,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 7/30/03

Nadya Gordon 7/30/03
Nadya Gordon Date